

The Linnaean collection is temporarily housed in the British Museum (Natural History). The specimen in this collection labelled "4. oleracea" is unquestionably conspecific with the "species C" of Hemmingsen and Lemche. This is confirmed by the dissection of the genitalia of this specimen, which is a male. However, contrary to the reports of Hemmingsen and Lemche, quoting Mannheims (1952, Tipulidae, in Lindner; *Fliegen palaearkt. Reg.* (15) : 76) this specimen does bear the reference number (4) to this species in the *Syst. Nat.* and there is nothing to suggest that this specimen is not the type specimen of Linnaeus.

In paragraph 8(d) Hemmingsen and Lemche refer to the possible homonymy of *Tipula fusca* Staeger, 1840, but could find no reference to this. As reported by Hutson and Vane-Wright (1969, *Entomologist's Gaz.* 20 : 237) *Tipula fusca* Staeger, 1840, is preoccupied by *Tipula fusca* Bloch, 1776 (*Beschäft. berlin. Ges. naturf. Fr.*, 2 : 175), erected for a specimen described from amber.

Mannheims (1966, *Bonn. zool. Beitr.*, 15 : 266) notes that *Tipula paludosa* Meigen, 1830 is preoccupied by *Tipula paludosa* Fabricius, 1794 (*Ent. Syst.*, 4 : 239). Fabricius' specimen(s) is lost (*teste* Zimsen, 1964, *The Type Material of I.C. Fabricius*. Copenhagen, p. 449) and the name must therefore be regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

With regard to these points added to those of Hemmingsen and Lemche to conform with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature the names that would have to be employed for the species of this group are as follows:—

sp.A ("oleracea Linnaeus, 1758") = *submendosa* Tjeder, 1941

sp.B ("paludosa Meigen, 1830") = *fimbriata* Meigen, 1818

sp.C ("czizeki de Jong, 1925") = *oleracea* Linnaeus, 1758

This would be a most unfortunate decision resulting in considerable confusion both for taxonomists and non-taxonomists involved in the study of this much quoted species. We therefore feel that the Code, produced as a guide toward a stable nomenclature, should not be used to add further confusion to an already confusing situation, and that the proposals of Hemmingsen and Lemche (viz. to retain the names *oleracea*, *paludosa* and *czizeki* in the combination listed above) should be accepted.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME *GALAXIAS DELFINI* PHILIPPI, 1895 (PISCES, GALAXIIDAE). ZN.(S.) 1877

By Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

The case of *Galaxias delfini* does not have any formal proposals, i.e. it is not crystal clear what are the actions to be taken by the Commission. May I translate the informal suggestions given by the author, and present the following proposals:

1. Under the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *delfini* Philippi, 1895, as cited in the combination *Galaxias delfini*.
2. To place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology the specific name *delfini* Philippi, 1895 as cited in the combination *Galaxias delfini*.

ADDITION TO THE APPLICATION CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF *DIOMEDEA LEPTORHYNCHA* COUES, 1866. Z.N.(S.) 1947 (See volume 28 : 106)

By George E. Watson (*Curator, Division of Birds, Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C.*)

The name *Diomedea leptorhyncha* Coues, 1866, has never been used as a senior synonym in the primary literature. On the other hand, *Diomedea irrorata* Salvin, 1883, has been used repeatedly in biological and conservation literature dealing with

the Galapagos Albatross during the past 50 years. The following is a list of references which satisfies the requirements of Article 79(b):

- Brosset, A. 1963. *Alauda* 31 : 83
 Fisher, A. K. and Wetmore, A. 1931. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.* 79 (10) : 26
 Fleming, C. A. 1950 *Emu* 49 : 176
 Harris, M. P. 1969. *J. Zool., Lond.* 159 : 151
 1969. *Ibis* 111 : 97
 1973. *Ibis* 115 : 483
 Helmayr, C. E. and Conover, B. 1948. *Catalogue of birds of the Americas*, Part 1, No. 2 : 43
 Koepke, M. 1964. *Las aves del departamento de Lima, Peru* : 12 1970. *The birds of the department of Lima, Peru* : 18
 Lévêque, R. 1963. *Terre Vie* 110 : 408
 Meyer de Schauensee, R. 1966. *The species of birds of South America* : 12
 1970. *A guide to the birds of South America* Livingston Publishing Company, for Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Wynnewood : 12
 Murphy, R. C. 1925. *Bird islands of Peru*. New York & London : 273
 1936. *Oceanic birds of South America*. New York : 530
 Nelson, B. 1968. *Galapagos*. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., London : 321
 Olog, C. C. 1968. *Las aves sudamericanas* vol. 1, Universidad Nacional de Tucuman, Tucuman : 52
 Peters, J. L. 1931. *Checklist of birds of the world*, vol. 1 : 43
 Stresemann, E. and Stresemann, V. 1966. *J. Orn. Lpz.* 107 (Sonderheft) : 299
 Swarth, H. S. 1931. *Occ. Pap. Calif. Acad. Sci.* 18 : 33
 Thomson, A. L. 1964. *A new dictionary of birds* : 44
 Vincent, J. 1966. *Int. Un. Protect. Nature Red data book* vol. 2: Aves : 2/31
 Watson, G. E. and Divoky, G. J. 1971. *Condor* 73 : 487
 Wetmore, A. 1965. *The birds of the Republic of Panama*, vol. 1. *Smithson. misc. Collns* 150 : 34

Thus a *prima facie* case can be made under Article 79(b) of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature for the suppression of *Diomedea leptorhyncha* Coues, 1866, in favour of *Diomedea irrorata* Salvin, 1883, which is the name exclusively used for the Galapagos Albatross.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *PARAONIS* GRUBE,
 1872 IN FAVOUR OF *PARAONIS* CERRUTI, 1909 UNDER THE
 PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1993
 (See volume 29 : 209-211)

By P. Uschakov (Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, USSR) and
 V. Strelzov (Murmansk Marine Biological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Dalnie
 Zelentsy, Murmansk, USSR)

It has been suggested to us that the name *Paraonis* might be retained with its original author and date by the designation of a neotype for *Paraonis tenera* Grube, 1872. This is, from the nominal point of view rather interesting, for by choosing *Aonides fulgens* as neotype the same result would be achieved in nomenclature as that suggested by us. However, as far as taxonomy is concerned, a solution of this kind imposes certain difficulties.

In describing *Paraonis tenera* certain features (a caruncle—a dorsal antenna on the prostomium, special neuropodial setae) are mentioned. These make us suppose that *Paraonis tenera* is one of the species belonging to the genus *Aricidea*. Besides, *Aonides fulgens* is not to be met with in the parts where *Paraonis tenera* has been found and described. It is the latter circumstance that makes us hold that the suggestion that we sent to the Commission would be more to the point.